Case 1:02-cv-00648-WDQ Document 149-3 Filed 02/20/2006 Page 1 of 2

EXHIBIT A



July 6, 2005

VIA FAX AND FIRST CLASS MAIL

Tracy Hudson Spicer U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Baltimore District Office 10 South Howard Street, 3rd Floor Baltimore, MD 21201

EEOC and Koch v. LA Weight Loss Centers, Inc.

Dear Tracv:

I write in response to your July 5, 2005, letter regarding LAWL's June 20, 2005, correspondence detailing EEOC's insufficient discovery responses. We disagree that LAWL's objections were untimely or in breach of Local Rule 104.8. During the parties' May 26, 2005, conference call, in which you and Ronald Phillips participated, we discussed a number of outstanding discovery issues. Included among them was LAWL's dissatisfaction with EEOC's May 4, 2005, responses to interrogatories. In light of the settlement discussions at that time, we proposed writing a letter to EEOC explaining LAWL's position. Mr. Phillips acknowledged the existence of a discovery dispute and agreed to await receipt of our letter.

Given the parties' conference call and their history of mutual extensions of time for purposes of dispute resolution, we were quite surprised and put off by your letter. Notwithstanding, we remain committed to resolving this discovery dispute. Please call me at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely,

aliza K. Karetnick/201 Aliza R. Karetnick

For WOLF, BLOCK, SCHORR and SOLIS-COHEN LLP

ARK

PHL:5182325.1/LAW024-158357